

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,552	07/30/2003	Brock Lape	839-1435	1551
30024	7590 09/19/2005		EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C. 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			HARMON, CHI	RISTOPHER R
ARLINGTON, VA 22203		JOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	3721	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/604,552	LAPE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Christopher R. Harmon	3721				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 Au</u> This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under Extended 	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed to the content of the conten	r election requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					

Application/Control Number: 10/604,552 Page 2

Art Unit: 3721

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/29/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Trinh et al. (US 2004/0244413).

Trinh et al. disclose an adhesive bag device comprising polymer sheet 505; adhesive tape 541 along the marginal edges 527; see figure 20. Double sided adhesive tape can be used to reuse the bag along the marginal edges; see page 4, paragraph 52.

Application/Control Number: 10/604,552 Page 3

Art Unit: 3721

The sheet is adapted to be folded over in order to adhere to the marginal edges. This bag structure could be used for a stator bar leak test.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Trinh et al. (US 2004/0244413) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

The invention to Trinh et al. is capable of performing the a stator bar leak test, however does not disclose the specific composition of materials and/or dimensions as claimed in claims 2-8 (at page 4, paragraph 54 Trinh et al. disclose various alternates including nonporous plastic film). The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that

- 1) an acrylic adhesive on a polypropylene substrate is a well known form of double sided adhesive tape; and
 - 2) polyvinyl chloride film is a well known form of a nonporous plastic film.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the use of an acrylic adhesive on a polypropylene substrate and a polyvinyl chloride film in the invention to Trinh et al. for forming the bag.

Application/Control Number: 10/604,552

Art Unit: 3721

Regarding the dimensional limitations of claims 4-6 and 8, applicant failed to traverse the examiner's previous assertion of Official Notice (see Final Rejection paragraph 3.

6. Alternatively, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klawitter (US 4,918,834) in view of Trinh et al. (US 2004/0244413).

Klawitter discloses a bag for covering a stator coil/bar; see figure 1. The bag does not comprise double sided tape on each marginal edge. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the bag of Klawitter as provided by Beck in order to provide for an economic and disposable bag for covering a stator bar.

Regarding claims 2-8, see above paragraph.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Note that a limitation directed to an intended use of an apparatus or a process requires a structural difference or a manipulative difference between the claimed invention and the prior art. See *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 938, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); *In re Sinex*, 309 F.2d 488, 492, 135 USPQ 302, 305 (CCPA 1962); *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed.Cir. 1997).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/604,552

Art Unit: 3721

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Harmon whose telephone number is (571) 272-4461. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on (571) 272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ch

LOUIS K. HUYNH PRIMARY EXAMINER